

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This *Draft General Management Plan / Environmental Impact Statement* evaluates alternative management approaches for Mojave National Preserve in the northeastern Mojave Desert in California. Mojave is a new unit of the National Park Service (NPS) established by Congress on October 31, 1994, by the California Desert Protection Act (CDPA). This is one of three documents prepared by the Northern and Eastern Mojave planning team as part of an interagency coordinated planning effort. The team also is preparing a draft General Management Plan for Death Valley National Park, and a California Desert Conservation Area Plan amendment for the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands. All three documents are anticipated for release at about the same time, however, the BLM plan amendment may be distributed somewhat later.

As a new unit of the national park system, Mojave has no existing management plans in place. This effort will produce the first general management plan that will serve as the overall management strategy for the next 10–15 years. More detailed activity or implementation plans will be prepared under this plan. The *General Management Plan* is general in nature, rather than specific, and focuses on purposes of the unit, its significant attributes, its mission in relation to the overall mission of the agency, what activities are appropriate within these constraints, and resource protection strategies. It also provides guidelines for visitor use and development of facilities for visitor enjoyment and administration of the unit.

The impetus for this plan was the passage of the California Desert Protection Act on October 31, 1994. This act transferred over 3 million acres of the California Desert from the Bureau of Land Management to the National Park Service and designated nearly 8 million acres of wilderness on NPS and BLM lands. In addition, the CDPA created the Mojave National Preserve and redesignated Death Valley and Joshua Tree National Monuments as national parks. Changes in the management of the public lands in the California desert, including listing of the desert tortoise, increasing development, public use pressures, and passage of the CDPA, caused NPS, BLM, and Fish and Wildlife (FWS) desert managers to address the anticipated changes in management of these federal lands by looking at management issues beyond traditional boundaries. Three sub-regional planning teams were established in the desert region of southern California: the West Mojave Plan (WMP) in the western Mojave Desert, the Northern and Eastern Mojave Planning Effort (NEMO) in the northern and eastern Mojave Desert, and the Northern and Eastern Colorado Planning Effort (NECO) in the northern and eastern Colorado Desert. These teams would gather information, define issues, and develop methods for issue resolution. The National Park Service, which manages most of the land in the northern and eastern Mojave Desert, took the lead for the NEMO interagency planning effort. The other participating agencies are the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. The Bureau of Land Management is the lead for the West Mojave Plan and the Northern and Eastern Colorado Planning Effort. The planning region boundaries for all three areas will cease to exist when the planning efforts are completed.

The planning team conducted 20 public meetings in September 1995 and April 1997 to gather public input on the management direction for the parks and BLM lands. From this input and meetings with interested parties (such as county departments, special interest groups, state

agencies, Native American tribes, etc.) and discussions with NPS and BLM staff, proposed management plans were developed. This proposed plan for Mojave National Preserve (alternative 1) is compared with existing management or the no-action alternative (alternative 2), and with a third optional management approach (alternative 3). Table 1 provides a summary of the actions examined under each alternative. Table 2 is a summary of the primary effects of each action.

After public comments on the proposed action and alternatives are received and considered, the National Park Service will prepare a final environmental impact statement (FEIS). Thirty days after release of the final environmental impact statement a record of decision will be produced. Soon after the record of decision a summary General Management Plan and Land Protection Plan for the preserve will be released. These documents will be summary presentations of the management direction arrived at through the public process.

TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES
MOJAVE NATIONAL PRESERVE

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|--|---|--|
| GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protecting resources and providing for visitor enjoyment are primary goals. Balance this mission with the other Congressional mandates, such as maintaining grazing, hunting, and mining under NPS regulations, and continue existence of major utility corridors. Preserve is a self-sustaining natural environment and a cultural landscape, where native desert ecosystems and processes are assured for future generations. Manage preserve in a manner to perpetuate the sense of discovery and adventure. Look to adjacent communities to provide most support services and facilities. Restore Kelso Depot to serve as a museum and interpretive facility. Provide funding for purchase of property from willing sellers where proposed uses conflict with primary mission. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Follow the existing management approach that the National Park Service has been following since the creation of Mojave National Preserve by the 1994 California Desert Protection Act. These actions are typically referred to as the “status quo” or no action alternative, since this is what would occur if no planning was undertaken. Most of the actions continue policies that are now being followed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative is the same as the proposed action, except for a greater emphasis on visitor services and facilities. |
| NATURAL RESOURCES | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resource management activities would be guided by a natural and cultural resources management plan. Staffing and funding increases would be requested to correspond with added responsibilities identified in this plan. Priorities determined through Strategic Plan Partnerships with educational institutions and other agencies would be sought to inventory and monitor resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Management of resources currently guided by direction provided in the enabling legislation and NPS regulations and policies. Development of a natural and cultural resource management plan is underway. Staffing and funding for this program would remain at the current level, with modest increases possible through special initiatives. Project priorities would be determined based on existing staff availability and funding. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Air Quality/ Visibility/Night Sky/Noise</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Park Service would actively participate in adjacent land use planning and monitor the visual, air, night sky, and water resources of the preserve. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff reviews and comments on adjacent project proposals, as they become aware of them. No systematic monitoring of air, water, night sky or noise currently underway. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <i>Water Resources</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Water would be used in accordance with legal authority and with consideration for the needs of other water users. Water would be used efficiently and frugally. NPS would seek to protect, perpetuate, and possibly restore surface water and groundwater as integral components of park aquatic and terrestrial ecosystems. Surface water and groundwater withdrawn for the public use would be the minimum amount necessary to achieve preserve purposes. All water withdrawn for domestic use would be returned watershed system once it has been treated to ensure that there would be no impairment of preserve resources. The effects to the preserve's resources from water withdrawn from sources outside of the preserve would be monitored. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Floodplain & Wetland Areas</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Occupancy and modification of floodplain and wetland areas would be avoided wherever possible. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Water Developments</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use of water developments (guzzlers, livestock tanks, and troughs) would be examined. Developments benefiting vegetation and wildlife would remain. National Park Service would begin restoring self-sustaining natural water sources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing guzzlers, livestock tanks, and troughs are maintained with the Superintendent's permission. Motorized access to guzzlers within wilderness for the purpose of maintenance or replenishment of water are reviewed on a case-by-case basis. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Water Rights</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPS and BLM work to protect federal water rights established by the CDPA and other authorities. NPS and BLM have agreed to incorporate respective policies, guidelines and listed principles to manage and protect federal water rights. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> State records in Sacramento have been searched to identify outstanding water rights. The NPS has taken steps to convert water rights in Mojave from BLM to NPS records. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action |
| <i>Sensitive Species</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Park Service would protect sensitive species and continue to work with CSU and FWS to protect the Mohave tui chub. National Park Service would implement measures in the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to protect the desert tortoise. Developers in desert tortoise critical habitat on preserve land would be required to purchase prime replacement habitat for the desert tortoise per formula. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A preliminary list of species of special concern has been assembled. The desert tortoise and its habitat are being managed indirectly through other resource management (hunting, burros, grazing...) No changes in management of the Mohave tui chub are proposed. The artificial pond population at Soda Springs is maintained in cooperation with the FWS, CDF&G and the Desert Studies Center consortium. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| <i>Introduced Species</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonnative plants and animals would not be introduced. Management actions, including eradication would be undertaken. Burros would be removed by a multi-phased approach including capture, adoption and possible direct reduction of last few animals to reach a zero population level. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efforts to reduce burro populations from current population of over 1,300 animals to previous BLM herd management level of 130 animals through live capture and adoption are made each year. Tamarisk eradication efforts would continue as part of interagency efforts. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Disturbed Land Restoration</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disturbed land restoration and native species restoration would be encouraged. Natural and cultural areas would be evaluated per listed guidelines for proper treatments. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ongoing efforts by National Park Service to restore existing disturbed lands. New disturbance proposed requires restoration. Removal of hazardous materials from sites continues Project specific restoration work is planned. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Native Species Restoration</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Park Service would strive to restore extirpated native species whenever certain criteria can be met. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No ongoing efforts exist to reintroduce extirpated native species. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Fire Management</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Document and assess the state of existing fire effects research in desert ecosystems and formulate desert fire management strategy and plan. Research burns may be initiated within specific prescriptions and burn sites would be monitored to assess changes over time. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing policy is to suppress all fires. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Paleontological Resources</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Paleontological resources would be protected, preserved, and interpreted for public enjoyment and scientific research in accordance with park management objectives and approved resource management plans. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No active program in effect to gather data or interpret resources. Scientific research conducted by entities other than National Park Service. Random patrols of backcountry. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Cave Resources</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A cave management plan would be prepared for significant cave resources. The NPS would work cooperative with CA Dept. of Parks and Recreation on cave resources found at Providence Mountains State Recreation Area. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No action is being taken on cave resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Inventorying and Monitoring</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPS would consult with resource experts to develop a comprehensive strategy for this work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> An annual strategic plan would be prepared with resource plans to guide this work. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Cultural Resources</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Develop and implement program to identify, inventory, interpret and nominate archeological sites, historical properties, cultural landscapes and ethnographic resources to National Register. Develop and implement a systematic applied cultural resource program. Mojave's resource management plan would address the requirements, projects and funding to implement the cultural resource program. Develop collaborative partnerships | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current emphasis on compliance to meet the requirements of the National Historic Preservation Act and NPS <i>Cultural Resource Management Guidelines</i>. Present cultural resource management programs include limited data collection and inventory of archeological sites, ethnographic resources, and historic properties; preparation and updating of list of classified structures; preparation of cultural resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>with government agencies, public and private organizations that have cultural resource management or research expertise.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The historic Zzyzx facilities would be maintained in accordance with NPS historic structures standards. | <p>studies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited protection of cultural sites by sporadic ranger patrols, with remedial actions focused primarily on high use visitor areas. | |
| NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation and coordination with tribes would be conducted on a regular basis. Systematic consultation agreement and protocols to be developed. NPS liaison would meet regularly with the tribe's representatives and discuss local issues. Review board would be formed to consider tribal requests, to cooperate on joint monitoring of resource use and to resolve differences concerning resource use. Work with Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide for training internships for tribal members. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation and coordination with historically associated Tribes conducted on specific projects. No systematic consultation plan to provide guidance on when and what issues to consult on. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| VISITOR USE, SERVICES AND FACILITIES | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing and funding for visitor services and maintenance of facilities would increase as new services and facilities are funded. Few major changes over existing conditions, except for restoration of Kelso Depot and minor improvements to visitor facilities would be made. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staffing and funding for visitor services and maintenance of facilities is expected to remain at approximately constant levels. Some special initiative projects, repair and replacement funds and routine cyclic maintenance funding are anticipated. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action, except for increased emphasis on visitor services and facilities to enhance the visitor understanding of the resources. |
| <i>Interpretive and Orientation Program</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> National Park Service would develop an interpretive plan that focuses on major themes. Overall objective of the interpretation program would be to support an experience relatively free of development and improvements, with opportunities to experience a sense of exploration and discovery, and to encourage sustainable, low impact recreation. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interpretation programs operated in and out of information centers in Baker, Needles and Hole-in-the-Wall. No overall interpretive plan in place. Ranger-led walks and talks provided. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would increase the level of contact between NPS interpretive rangers and the public. There would be less focus on self-guided interpretation. |
| <i>Interpretation and Orientation Facilities</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A small information, visitor contact center would be placed at the headquarters building in Barstow. Information centers at Baker and Needles would continue to operate with current focus. Hole-in-the-Wall visitor contact center would continue to serve visitors with information and interpretive programs. A self-guided interpretive and orientation program at Soda Springs would be updated and improved. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing NPS visitor information centers at Baker and Needles serve as the initial visitor contact points. Hole-in-the-Wall visitor contact center is the only NPS facility within the boundary that provides staffed visitor information. Very few road or trailsides exhibits exist. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new information center may be constructed at Baker. A nature center would be considered in the development concept plans for Hole-in-the-Wall. A small facility at Soda Springs would be built to support a staffed interpretive program. A development concept |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|---|--|---|
| | <p>Facilities may be rehabilitated or replaced with new facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few additional road or trailside interpretive and information displays and wayside exhibits would be developed. • Existing exhibits would be analyzed for accuracy and consistency with interpretive themes. Some may be removed and/or replaced. • Portable information would be developed to support self-guided interpretive program and to provide advance information for visitors. • A special educational outreach effort would be made to reach students that might otherwise not have an opportunity to visit national parks. | | <p>plan would be prepared.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for more wayside exhibits and interpretive displays. • Less focus on self-guided interpretation than in the proposed alternative. • Trailhead parking displays would be established, as need warrants. |
| <i>Kelso Depot</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kelso Depot would be restored to its period of historic significance for use as a museum and interpretive facility. • Office space, minimal overnight lodging for NPS staff and reopening of the Beanery restaurant are other proposed uses. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding being sought to stabilize Kelso Depot and restore landscaping. • Minimal on site interpretation or other visitor facilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stabilize the Kelso Depot and restore landscaping. • Provide external displays, information contact center and comfort station. |
| <i>Education and Outreach</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to pursue partnerships with school teachers and university field offices at Soda Springs and Granite Mountain to provide students and the public with current information on the cultural and natural elements of the preserve. • Special educational and outreach efforts would be undertaken to reach students that might otherwise not have an opportunity to visit national parks and other disadvantaged populations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NPS staff work with local schools and at area day camps and other off site groups to provide information on the preserve. • UC and CSU separately develop and sponsor classes in the preserve. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Day Use Only Areas</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Areas are designated for day use only to avoid the potential conflict between day use recreational visitors and camping use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No day use only areas are established. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Recreational Day Use Activities</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Park Service would not allow recreational activities that are inconsistent with preserve mission, would cause unacceptable impacts to visitors or resources, or would pose a safety hazard. • The preserve would adopt climbing guidelines, such as clean climbing techniques, to allow rock climbers to enjoy their experiences while promoting responsible public actions and protecting natural and cultural resources. • Hunting is limited to game birds, deer and bighorn sheep during their normal State seasons. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Climbing activities permitted under NPS policy and regulations. • Hunting, fishing, and trapping would continue to follow existing California Department of Fish and Game's hunting regulations. • Collecting non-game birds, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates not permitted under NPS regulations. • Fishing permitted under State fishing regulations and NPS regulations at 36 CFR. • Trapping permitted under State regulations and NPS regulations at 36 CFR. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Same as proposed action except, hunting, fishing, and trapping would be limited to the months of October through February for all game and non-game animals. |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---|---|--|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Fishing permitted under State fishing regulations and NPS regulations at 36 CFR. Collecting non-game birds, reptiles, amphibians and invertebrates not permitted under NPS regulations. Trapping permitted with restrictions. | | |
| <i>Signs</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Signs would be unobtrusive and designed to blend with the natural environment. Maps and other media would be provided to reduce need for signs. Sign plan to be prepared. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning underway for entrance signs at along major highway entrance. Existing signs being evaluated for retention, modification or removal. Few new signs being added. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Developed Campgrounds</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing and additional improvements would continue at Mid Hills campground. No changes are proposed for Hole-in-the-Wall campground. Campsite densities would not be increased. Campsites and trails in the Mid Hills campground would be redesigned to increase the level of accessibility for people with disabilities and for other purposes. Locations for new semideveloped campgrounds would be considered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mid Hills and Hole-in-the-Wall campgrounds are the only developed campgrounds operated by the National Park Service (total of 61 sites). Hole-in-the-Wall campground has a significant level of accessibility for visitors with disabilities. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If visitation and demand for campsites increases, the number of campsites in developed campgrounds would be increased, but the density would remain the same. Locations for a group campsite at or near Mid Hills campground would provide a cooler alternative in the summer than Hole-in-the-Wall. |
| <i>Backcountry and Roadside Camping</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Previously used backcountry campsites would be considered open unless designated as closed. To protect sensitive resources, some campsites may be closed and camping activities relocated elsewhere. Resource conditions and visitor use would be monitored at certain locations to determine need for sites. Limit camping in high use areas to designated campsites, per previous BLM direction. Some sites may be closed to avoid conflict with private property. Backcountry structures on public land would remain open for public use unless problems related to visitor health and safety are identified. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Roadside camping allowed only in previously disturbed campsites along existing routes. Most backcountry structures on public land are available for public use with no restrictions. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In sensitive areas (desert tortoise critical habitat, mines, cultural sites), vehicle-based roadside camping confined to a limited number of designated campsites having a metal fire ring or campsite marker as identification for use. Areas of high use would be improved with metal fire rings and picnic tables at each campsite (except Mojave Road). |
| <i>Visitor Use Fees</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preserve would explore options for increasing fee collection revenues consistent with Congressional direction. A fee study would determine feasibility of collecting entrance fees. Camping fees would continue to be collected at the Hole-in-the-Wall and Mid Hills campgrounds. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Camping fees are collected at the Hole-in-the-Wall and Mid Hills campgrounds. No entrance fees are collected. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Commercial Services</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Possible concession operation for food service at Beanery restaurant in Kelso Depot. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All commercial activity requires permit. No contracts exist for concession | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|------------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All commercial activity requires permit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> facilities in the preserve, and none are anticipated at this time. Filming and business permits are granted on a case-by-case basis. | |
| ROADS AND CIRCULATION | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes in the existing roads are anticipated. Some limited upgrading of heavily used roads may be undertaken as funds permit. A road management plan may be prepared to provide detailed guidance for management of existing road system. Vehicle use in the preserve is limited to street legal vehicles. No off road driving is permitted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes to existing roads are anticipated. NPS is seeking formal agreement with San Bernardino County on road maintenance. Kelso Dunes access road improved with crushed rock to reduce wash boarding. No maintenance is performed on high clearance and four wheel drive backcountry roads, except for emergency repairs. Vehicle use is limited to street legal vehicles and no off road driving is permitted. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Mojave Road</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mojave Road would remain open for street legal vehicles, mountain bikes, equestrian and hikers. Business permits would not be granted for commercial guided tours of the Mojave Road. Maintenance would be limited to repairs needed to allow continued vehicle passage. Traditional rock cairns, maps, guide books or other media would be the primary guides for route finding. Large groups using the road that have seven or more vehicles, or more than 15 people would be required to camp at designated areas and obtain a special use permit. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mojave Road is open for use, with limited restrictions on the type of use it receives. Street legal vehicles are permitted. Camping along the road would continue to be regulated under restrictions under the preserve's interim management plan. No directional or interpretive signs would be installed along the road. Business permits required for commercial tours of the road. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Business permits would be allowed for commercial guided tours of the Mojave Road. Large groups would be allowed to camp in any pre-disturbed areas along the Mojave Road corridor with a special use permit. NPS would use permit system to protect against overuse of the road. Monitoring of use would be done and a limit of 1,000 vehicles over existing annual use would be established. This limit would be reevaluated and adjusted as needed. |
| <i>Trails</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Backcountry/wilderness management plan would address trail use by hikers, equestrian, bicycles, and disabled. Pedestrian walks or single track trails would not be open to stock use. All other trails would be open for use by hikers and equestrian use. Bicycles allowed on all roads, but not on single track trails, off road, or in designated wilderness. Roads closed by the designation of wilderness would be considered for use as trails. Efforts would be made to create more accessible trails. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No trails planning or development is anticipated. No trailheads or parking areas for trail use are planned. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Trains</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If Amtrak resumes passenger train | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Passenger train service | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>service, the NPS would work to place NPS interpreters on trains and allow passengers to stop at Kelso Depot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPS would support train stops at Barstow and Nipton, CA, and at Primm, NV. | <p>discontinued by Amtrak in 1997.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No programs to seek access to Mojave. | <p>action.</p> |
| ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES | | | |
| <i>Administration</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Examine options for constructing or leasing a new headquarters office in Barstow. Fire protection services would continue to be located at Hole-in-the-Wall. Offices for staff would be located in Needles, Baker, Kelso Depot, and Hole-in-the-Wall. Baker would become the interim central maintenance operation. New facilities would be constructed at the existing yard. A mobile maintenance operation would be developed to support maintenance needs. NPS would explore possibility of a shared highway equipment and materials staging yard at Kelso or Essex. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Headquarters located in Barstow. Maintenance operation overseen out of Barstow, with field satellite offices in Baker and Hole-in-the-Wall. Baker facility is the main field office and shop. The Hole-in-the-Wall operation would also receive limited improvements, but remain as a secondary support facility. Fire protection services located at Hole-in-the-Wall, in cooperation with the Bureau of Land Management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action, except in addition to the visitor information center at Needles, an office would be established on the east side of Mojave to provide space for maintenance, visitor services and resource management. |
| <i>Employee Housing</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing housing would be renovated, replaced, or removed after needs assessment, cost effectiveness and environmental evaluation. Employee housing would not be provided in Needles and Barstow. Some of the upper rooms in the Kelso Depot may be utilized for employee housing and temporary quarters for staff conducting field work. If existing buildings in the preserve are acquired by purchase or donation, NPS would evaluate historical value and cost effectiveness of bringing these buildings up to current standards for use as housing. Several housing units would be added at Kelso, Hole-in-the-Wall, and possibly other locations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing housing at Baker would be replaced and upgraded as funding permits. No additional housing would be provided. NPS-owned houses in Mojave would be evaluated for possible renovation per NPS policy. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More employee housing would be created in the preserve to place employees close to their work. Less emphasis on renovation of existing homes. |
| <i>Solid Waste Disposal</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Solid waste would continue to be hauled to an approved site outside the preserve. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Baker landfill was closed by state law in 1997. Federal law prohibits new landfills in all units of the national park system. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| EDUCATION AND RESEARCH CENTERS | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperative agreements would be developed with the California State University Consortium for management of Soda Springs Desert Research Center and the UC Regents for the Granite | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Soda Springs Desert Research Center and Granite Mountains Natural Reserve operating under informal agreement with the NPS. NPS working on elements of | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action, except: Unstaffed entry stations would be placed at key entry points to |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|--|---|--|
| | <p>Mountains Natural Reserve.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS would continue to be responsible for the review and approval of all research proposals on park land. Ranger led tours of Soda Springs and some of the Zzyzx structures would be coordinated with CSU to minimize impacts to CSU operations. CSU would continue to maintain all leased facilities at Soda Springs, except for the main entrance road from I-15 to the facility gate, and structures associated with visitor contact and interpretation. NPS would work with UC to ensure protection of research. | <p>cooperative agreements with California State University Consortium and the University of California.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No restrictions exist for public use of public lands at Soda Springs Desert Research Center. CSU maintains facilities at Soda Springs except facilities associated with visitor contact and interpretation. Discharge of weapons in the Granite Mt. Natural Reserve prohibited by San Bernardino County Ordinance and NPS. | <p>public use areas adjacent to and in the Granite Mountains Natural Reserve to inform visitors not to disturb research plots.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS and UC would jointly monitor sections of the Reserve that receive public use to determine if research plots are threatened. The NPS would seek a partnership with the Reserve to collaborate on research, interpretation, and education. |
| LAND OWNERSHIP AND USE | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as existing management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nonfederal rights on federal lands regulated through existing NPS and other regulations. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action, but less acquisition. |
| <i>Boundary and Authorized Acreage</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No changes in the boundary of the preserve are proposed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Final boundary map submitted to Congress. Authorized acreage identified in section 502 differs from actual acreage due to more accurate computer calculations that indicate total acreage of 1,589,165 acres exist within the external boundary of Mojave. Approximately 170,000 acres of private land occur within the external boundary of the preserve. Of this, 85,318 acres are owned by Catellus Corp. About 90% of the remaining private land is split among 1,200 owners. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Wilderness</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Manage wilderness for maximum statutory protection per CDPA, for use and enjoyment of the American people in such manner as would leave them unimpaired for future use and enjoyment as wilderness. Wilderness/Backcountry plan may be prepared. Once completed, final wilderness boundary maps and legal descriptions would be submitted to Congress. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wilderness management currently focused on occasional overflights and other monitoring efforts to identify illegal uses. Wilderness boundaries in Figure 2 reflect the preliminary final interpretation of Congressional maps. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Land Acquisition</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land Protection Plan would guide land acquisition. The NPS would seek funds to acquire private lands and interests from willing sellers. Donations and exchanges from willing sellers are pursued. Private land in wilderness, habitat for | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS purchase of private lands and interests is not an ongoing or active program. Donations and exchanges from willing sellers are pursued, and third party acquisitions from willing sellers are encouraged. Exchange of School sections | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private lands or interests would only be acquired on an opportunity basis if the NPS were approached by a landowner wanting to sell, or if a development project |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---|---|---|---|
| | <p>threatened or endangered species and riparian areas are considered high priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Private land in Lanfair Valley that is currently developed with single-family homes would not be acquired unless requested by owner. Exchange of School sections would continue. | <p>ongoing per CDPA direction.</p> | <p>would adversely affect park resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exchange of School sections would continue. |
| <i>Mineral Development Activities</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as existing management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mojave National Preserve was closed to new mining claim location and all forms of appropriation and disposal under public land and mineral laws by the CDPA. Existing unpatented mining claims required by CDPA to undergo validity to determine if a discovery exists. Mineral development on valid mining claims regulated in accordance with 36 CFR Part 9A. Acquisition initiated when proposed development fails to meet 9A approval standards and no alternative development scenario is feasible. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPS would prepare a mineral management plan that analyzes sensitive resource values and the potential impacts of likely mineral development scenarios. Where mineral development would significantly conflict with resource values, the NPS would seek funding to acquire the mineral rights. Until funds were appropriated, proposed mining operations would be evaluated under NPS regulations at 36 CFR Part 9A as under existing management. |
| <i>Abandoned Mines</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NPS would develop an active abandoned mineral lands inventory and reclamation program. Program goal to eliminate safety hazards and hazardous materials, restore disturbed soils and vegetation, protect bat habitat and preserve or stabilize significant cultural resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inventory of abandoned mining properties has been initiated. No reclamation or stabilization of properties ongoing. Hazardous materials being cleaned up as discovered. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Sand and Gravel for Road Maintenance</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as existing management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sand, gravel, cinder, etc. on federal lands not available for extraction or sale. Use of borrow materials for road maintenance must conform with existing NPS policy that requires materials to be obtained from non-preserve sources, unless uneconomical. Preserve is preparing cooperative agreement with the County of San Bernardino for limited use of borrow sites to maintain roads in the preserve. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as existing management. |
| <i>Grazing/Range Management</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cattle grazing privileges would continue to be managed under NPS regulations, policies, and preserve management direction at no more than the current level as of October 31, 1994. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS has issued Special Use Permits to five ranchers to continue grazing cattle on ten allotments. Allotment boundaries, AUMs, and the rules and restrictions are the | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limited new range developments may be permitted. No community based grazing management |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| | PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL APPROACH (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|-----------------------------|---|---|--|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Superintendent shall determine appropriate use, restrictions, and grazing fees. NPS would allow appropriate maintenance of existing range developments. If ranchers notify the Superintendent of their willingness to sell base property, the Superintendent would immediately notify the Secretary of Interior of the priority acquisition and request Land and Water Conservation funding from Congress (per Sec. 510 of CDPA). Mojave would also work with conservation organizations to purchase grazing permits from willing sellers. If a grazing permit is purchased and the new owners (i.e. conservation organizations) request retirement, the grazing permit would be permanently retired. Where credible, published research studies demonstrate that grazing is negatively impacting the desert tortoise, appropriate mitigation measures would be taken. A grazing management plan would be prepared for any active NPS grazing permits. A community based management team of ranchers, environmental organizations and park staff may be established to provide a forum for communications on range management practices. | <p>same as existed when the Bureau of Land Management managed the preserve prior to the CDPA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presently, there is no range monitoring, and there is limited monitoring of ranchers' compliance with permit conditions. Grazing allowed under the existing FWS Biological Opinion on the Desert Tortoise, amended March 1997) until this plan is completed or April 2000, whichever occurs first. Grazing fees received by the NPS based on the BLM's fee schedule (\$1.35/AUM). | <p>team would be sought.</p> |
| PLAN IMPLEMENTATION | | | |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Management Plan identifies further activity level planning needed to guide management of Mojave. Phased schedule provided for additional planning. Kelso Depot restoration first priority. Funds being sought for design and construction drawings to begin immediately after plan approval. Desert tortoise, burro removal, and grazing management strategies to begin immediately. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Priorities for allocation of staff and funding determined on a year by year basis using the Strategic Planning Process. Strategic plan sets five-year planning goals that could be revised and adjusted yearly. Staff and funding adjusted as needed to place resources where most appropriate to meet the demands. Activity level planning would be pursued, with most of the identified plans being completed within the next five years. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same as proposed action. |
| <i>Staffing and Funding</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Full implementation requires an additional \$2.6 million and 56 staff. Kelso Depot restoration proposal estimated to cost about \$5 million. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Current operating base budget is \$2.5 million and 36 staff. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This alternative would required an additional \$2.7 million and 57 staff over the existing levels. |

TABLE 2: SUMMARY OF IMPACTS**MOJAVE NATIONAL PRESERVE**

| PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|--|---|
| IMPACTS ON NATURAL ENVIRONMENT | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NPS participation in adjacent land use planning would benefit the visual, air, night sky, and water resources of the preserve. Desert tortoise recovery would be enhanced by removing burros, managing grazing per results of credible research, reducing vehicle related mortality in areas of desert tortoise concentrations and implementing other Recovery Plan recommendations. As non-natives (burros, tamarisk) are removed, natural water flow, wildlife, soil, and vegetation would benefit. Short term negative effects to soils and natural quiet may occur during burro roundups. Hardening or designation of camping spots in high use areas would reduce impacts to natural resources by eliminating the establishment of new campsites reducing the expansion of existing campsites. Closure of some campsites within sensitive habitat would reduce negative impacts to soil, water, other sensitive resources, and the desert tortoise. Hardening and designation of campsites in high use camping areas would reduce impacts to natural resources by reducing the possibilities of campsite expansion and creation of new campsites. The creation of semideveloped campgrounds would cause local disturbance to natural resources during construction and after from public use. Use of these campgrounds may reduce impacts to undeveloped areas by relocating visitor activities to semideveloped campgrounds. Construction of roadside pullouts for interpretive displays and a visitor center at Kelso Depot would create soil and plant disturbances. Kelso Depot use as a museum and interpretive facility would place increased demands on water resources. Potential purchase of grazing permits and their subsequent retirement would benefit native vegetation, wildlife, soil, and water resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Most negative impacts to the natural environment are due to the presence of burros and cattle. These impacts include: damage to soil crusts, reduced water infiltration, inhibit nitrogen fixation in desert plants, provide a favorable seed bed for exotic annuals, soil compaction, destruction to natural springs, and destruction to native vegetation. Vegetation is affected to varying degrees by the non-native burros and cattle foraging and their subsequent trampling of the soil and by camping activities. Burros are known to contaminate water sources (through defecation and urination), over-browse or eliminate aquatic and riparian vegetation, and monopolizing the use of springs or seeps. Developed water (wildlife guzzlers, mining and livestock water developments) may be affecting wildlife populations by allowing some to grow to levels unobtainable with available natural water. Presently hunting is allowed year-round with no limits on hares (black-tailed jackrabbits) and many non-game animals such as coyotes, skunks and opossum. The effects on these populations from hunting are unknown. Mining or agriculture activities on private or state lands and mining claims (about 15% of preserve) could negatively impact natural resources. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduction of grazing would benefit native vegetation, wildlife, soil, and water resources. Designated campsites and closure of others within sensitive habitat would reduce negative impacts to soil, water, other sensitive resources, and the desert. Formalizing camping areas at remote locations would reduce the expanding surface disturbance associated with continued use without set tables and tent pads. No hunting during active tortoise season would protect tortoises from random shooting by vandals. Disturbance would occur as a result of increased construction projects for facilities and signs, but would not exceed 15 acres. The presence of more staffed visitor centers would provide more opportunities for NPS staff to contact and educate the public on protection of natural resources, reducing potential for negative impacts to natural resources. |
| IMPACTS ON CULTURAL RESOURCES | | |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---|---|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Archeological resources, historical properties, cultural landscapes and ethnographic resources would benefit from the development of a systematic inventory, research and preservation program. • Flood-proofing the Kelso Depot would protect the historical building. • Reduced damage to cultural resources with burro removal. • Acquisition of private property could result in additional cultural resources being protected. • Potential reduction of grazing could be viewed negatively by people who view grazing as a historical use. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural resources are potentially threatened by burro and cattle trampling and by visitor camping or driving near isolated and unprotected sites and vandalism. • Historic properties listed on, or determined eligible for the National Register would continue to be afforded stabilization/ preservation treatment as funding allows. • The Kelso Depot would be stabilized and historic landscaping restored. Lack of staff presence means the building continues to be vulnerable to vandalism. Lack of fire protection could result in loss of building. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restriction on hunting seasons would allow more control on illegal use of weapons in non-hunting season and would enhance cultural resource protection. • Restrictions to roadside camping locations would result in greater protection and less disturbance of existing archeological sites and sensitive cultural sites. |
| IMPACTS ON NATIVE AMERICAN INTERESTS | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of consultation and coordination agreements with the tribes and establishment of communication protocols would increase the protection of Native American interests and sites. • Information could be provided at Kelso Depot, Baker and Needles information centers, and the Hole-in-the Wall to raise public understanding and appreciation of tribal ties to the Mojave Desert. • Native American sacred and traditional use areas would receive additional protection with the potential elimination of camping near such sites. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sporadic communication with tribes on project specific issues may result in misinformed decision-making and distrust due to lack of information. • Native American interests have not been fully identified and therefore may be inadvertently harmed. • Presence of information center in Needles provides NPS staff in a location where frequent contact and discussion is more feasible. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lower potential threat to sensitive cultural sites from campers using roadside campsites. |
| IMPACTS ON VISITOR USE, SERVICES, AND FACILITIES | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As burro numbers are reduced, there would be fewer opportunities to see burros. Some people would be upset over the direct reduction of last few burros. • To others, as the damaged habitat recovers, seeing fewer burros would be viewed as a positive impact. • Visitor safety would improve with an expected decrease in the number of traffic accidents involving burros or cattle. • Visitors would become more aware about resources and opportunities through preparation of an interpretive plan, creation of Kelso Depot interpretive facility and road and trailside displays and wayside exhibits. • Restoration of the depot and use as a museum and interpretive facility at the Kelbaker and Cima roads intersection would enhance visitor contacts. • Visitor enjoyment would be enhanced by the opportunity to visit the restored depot. • Minor traffic delays during Kelso Depot construction. • Increased traffic to visitor facilities on | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An increase in the number of vehicles combined with fast speeds would increase the potential for accidents. • Number of vehicle/cow and burro accidents would remain about the same, but decline slightly as numbers are reduced. • Visitor's experience would be affected by viewing cattle ranching, burros, mining, guzzlers and stock tanks and hunting and trapping activities. • Visitors would potentially experience development activities such as house building and other facilities, that may appear to conflict with the preserve's purpose. • Most visitors would continue to enter Mojave without any NPS contact prior to their visit, leaving a large percentage of these visitors with a limited amount of travel, safety or interpretive information. • Installation of entrance signs and information kiosks should increase | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting the hunting season to October through February would increase visitor safety, but negatively impact recreational opportunities for hunters. • Presence of more staffed visitor centers would provide better opportunities for NPS staff to contact and educate the public on resource protection. • Increased traffic on Kelbaker and Kelso-Cima roads to get to visitor facilities. • An increase in NPS use of Soda Springs facility for outreach classes and events could impact CSU operations. • Quality of experience camping on the Mojave Road would be increased with the permit system in place; however, this would limit the number of camping opportunities. • Improvements to some roadside campsites may adversely affect people who do |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Kelbaker and Cima roads.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reinforcement of dike by Kelso Depot would raise the level of protection from flooding for the depot and visitors. A information center at NPS headquarters in Barstow would increase the availability of information to the public in the Barstow area. Camping and day use restrictions may cause people to use areas elsewhere within the preserve or outside the boundary. Climbing guidelines may cause climbers to feel that they have less climbing opportunities. Improved access for people with disabilities to trails, facilities, and campsites would increase their opportunities. Camping opportunities on the Mojave Road would be reduced, but quality of the experience would be enhanced. The potential for passenger train service could reduce vehicle traffic congestion and would provide an enhanced visitor experience. Hunters would be impacted by not being able to hunt non-game species or trap in some areas, however, visitor safety would be enhanced. | <p>visitor understanding and safety, and reduce conflicts with private land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unlimited use of Mojave Road may adversely affect the condition of the road, and crowding may result at some areas along the road. If visitation and use dramatically increase, campgrounds may fill up more frequently, leaving some visitors without a place to camp. Limited public access to historic properties at Soda Springs would continue. | <p>not want changes made to their favorite campsites.</p> |
| IMPACTS ON SOCIOECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A separate analysis of socioeconomic conditions in the planning area and the effects of the proposed action was conducted by Dean Runyan Associates under contract to the NPS. That analysis concluded that no significant effects would occur in the NEMO planning area as a result of the proposed action. There would be some loss of grazing related jobs if allotments were acquired, but the overall effect would be offset by an increase in tourism jobs. | | |
| IMPACTS ON ADMINISTRATIVE OPERATIONS AND FACILITIES | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burro removal would increase costs and staff time over the short-term. Increase in staff and costs for operating and maintaining Kelso Depot and Barstow visitor contact center. New maintenance facilities at Baker and Hole-in-the-Wall would improve capabilities. New housing would decrease time for employees to get to their jobs and save vehicle fuel, but would increase maintenance workload. New housing at Baker would be more energy-efficient than existing trailers. Initial large administrative workload and cost to acquire properties, diminishing over time as nonfederal lands and interests are brought under public ownership. New properties acquired may also increase maintenance or stabilization costs. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maintaining a burro herd size at 130 animals would be the most expensive alternative over the long-term. The estimated cost for capture, transporting, adoption preparation and adoption is \$1,200 per animal. Grazing fees collected under the existing management are not sufficient to manage a grazing program. Additional funding would be needed. Campground administration support would be continued with staff and volunteers managing campgrounds. NPS staffing levels would not increase with this alternative; however, all workloads would increase limiting NPS's ability to serve the public and protect resources. Employee housing would remain inadequate and below NPS standards. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Providing office space on the east side of the preserve would provide better coverage of the preserve. Grazing fees could be used for range development and resource management projects. The creation of a visitor contact center, the nature center at Hole-in-the-Wall, would have additional staffing needs and costs. Campground expansions, improvements to backcountry sites and new interpretive and hiking trails would create additional staff workload. Monitoring and efforts needed to enforce the Mojave Road's vehicle capacity would require additional staff time. |
| IMPACTS ON EDUCATION AND RESEARCH | | |

Table 1: Summary of Proposed Action and Alternatives

| PROPOSED ACTION (ALTERNATIVE 1) | EXISTING MANAGEMENT (ALTERNATIVE 2) | OPTIONAL ALTERNATIVE (ALTERNATIVE 3) |
|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for disruption of research plots would be reduced through burro removal and monitoring efforts. Designated campsites in sensitive areas would reduce the potential for negative impacts to field research projects or sensitive resources. Replacement of visitor facilities and an upgraded self guided tour at Soda Springs may attract more visitors creating potential for conflicts between education and visitors. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cattle, burros and vandalism could disrupt or destroy research plots. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A shorter hunting season would increase the level of safety to researchers, students, and teachers. The NPS partnership with the Reserve to collaborate on research, interpretation, and public education would increase the public's awareness and understanding of natural and cultural resources. |
| IMPACTS ON LAND OWNERSHIP AND USE | | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced resource conflicts for private landowners and potential beneficial impacts to ranching operations with burro removal. Private property would be protected by closure of some roadside campsites. Private land could be acquired as funds are provided. Properties would be purchased at fair market value. Reduction of nonfederal ownership would result in fewer instances of visitor trespass problems for private landowners and greater management control of resource use in the preserve. Restrictions on grazing activities and ranching practices (seasonal closures, reduction in the number of cattle grazing in an area or relocation of a grazing allotment to another portion of the preserve outside of desert tortoise critical habitat) could affect allotment value. Impacts from cattle trespass from adjacent BLM allotments would be reduced with proposed fencing along NPS/BLM boundary. NPS efforts with signs and public education would help reduce impacts to private property from visitor use Impacts on mineral development activities same as existing management. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Free roaming burros and cattle present some resource use conflicts by foraging and use of water on unfenced private and state lands. Ranchers paying grazing fees and maintaining water sources are supporting burros at their expense. Increased visitation may cause conflicts with private landowners. Acquisition of mining properties that do not meet NPS regulatory approval standards would permanently remove those sites from potential mineral development, reducing the total amount of available mineral resources in the region that may be developed. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Grazing could be restricted as the Desert Tortoise Recovery Plan's recommendations are carried out. A shorter hunting season would result in less trespassing and fewer hunting accidents. Increased acquisition of mineral rights may occur as a result of the sensitive resource analysis and the identification of areas where mineral development would be incompatible with the Preserve mission. |